

Remarks

Claims 1-3, 7-13, 15-18, and 20-22 are pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 7-13, 15-18, and 20-22 now stand rejected. Claims 4-6, 14, and 19 have been cancelled. Claims 1 and 15 have been amended.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because the recitation “an open center” in line 16 should have been deleted as it was in line 3 of the claim due to being deemed new matter in the previous rejection. The phrase “open center” has been removed from claim 1.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-3, 7-8, 13, 15-18, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grether et al. (4,563,843) in view of Palmer (5,653,073).

While Applicant believes that claims 1 and 15 are patentable over Grether and Palmer, in the interest of expedited prosecution claim 1 has been amended to recite that the frame includes a first sealed chamber formed therein comprising a portion of the inner wall directly adjacent to the first enclosed space and a second sealed chamber formed therein comprising a portion of the inner wall directly adjacent to the second enclosed space, the first and second chambers containing desiccant moisture absorption material and each having perforations in the inner wall of the frame between the mounting surfaces to allow for the absorption of moisture from only the directly adjacent enclosed space. This amendment is supported in the specification at least at page 10, starting at line 9 and in Figs 3-4 (both as amended on August 6, 2009).

Grether, as shown in Figure 1 and described at Col. 5, lines 34-51, teaches a single drying chamber that is remote from the enclosed spaces and that communicates with all of the enclosed

air (4). Multiple holes (8) and bores (18) communicate such that air freely flows between the various panels. Accordingly, Grether does not teach two chambers that each comprise a portion of the inner wall and that only allow for absorption from a directly adjacent enclosed space.

Furthermore, the drying chamber of Grether also communicates through bore (20) with an air-filled antechamber (19) having inlet openings to the atmosphere. The drying chamber is therefore not sealed with the exception of perforations in the inner wall directly adjacent the enclosed spaces, but communicates freely with multiple spaces within the frame and the air outside the frame.

Claim 15 has been amended to include providing a frame segment having first and second chambers similar to claim 1 and that the method includes inserting a desiccant into the first and second chambers and sealing the first and second chambers. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Grether teaches a single chamber containing desiccant and the chamber is remote from the enclosed space and is not sealed.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 15 are patentable over Grether and Palmer and requests the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) to claims 1 and 15.

Claims 21 and 22 have not been amended because Applicant believes that they are patentable over Grether and Palmer as they stand. Claim 21 recites that the at least one chamber is sealed from the first and second enclosed spaces except for perforations in an inner wall of the frame between the mounting surfaces to allow for the absorption of moisture from only an apposing enclosed space. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Grether does not teach a chamber containing desiccant that is sealed with the exception of perforations in an inner wall apposed from an enclosed space. Instead, the drying chamber is remote from the enclosed space and not sealed. Claim 22 recites similar language and is patentable for at least the same reasons as above.

Claims 2-3, 7-8, 13, 16-18, and 20 depend from claims 1 and 15 and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) to said claims.

Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grether et al. (4,563,843) in view of Palmer (5,653,073) and further in view of Richardson et al. (5,910,083). Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grether et al. (4,563,843) in view of Palmer (5,653,073) and further in view of Roche (6,401,399). Claims 9-12 depend from claim 1 and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as above. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) to claims 9-12.

Conclusion

Applicants have made a genuine effort to respond to each of the Examiner's objections and rejections in advancing the prosecution of this case. Applicants believe that all formal and substantive requirements for patentability have been met and that this case is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. If any additional issues need to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at his/her earliest convenience.

The Petition fee of \$555.00 is being charged to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978 via electronic authorization submitted concurrently herewith. Please charge any fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,
Ross Campbell McKinlay et al.

By /Adam R. Southworth/
Adam R. Southworth
Reg. No. 65,407
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: February 28, 2011

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351